

## APPENDIX F.

### CATALOGING GUIDELINES BRAINSTORMING RESULTS

On October 25, 2005, a general call for cataloging simplification ideas to assist the Working Group in developing cataloging guidelines was posted on CONSRLST. On October 28, 2005, that general call was followed by survey questions. The survey posting, questions, and results are compiled here. Also included in this compilation are the results of a brainstorming sessions held at LC and other CONSER libraries, as well as "parking lot" issues the Working Group wanted to document as topics for possible future exploration.

**The Access Level Working Group would still like to hear from CONSER catalogers about aspects of cataloging serials that take up unnecessary time and effort. Below is a set of questions. Feel free to respond to any/all of these and/or provide other timesaving efforts for cataloging:**

**1. Do you think the statement of responsibility needs to be transcribed in the title and statement of responsibility area or elsewhere in the record? Why/why not?**

If it is the same as the name recorded in the publisher statement, I feel the statement of responsibility could be left out. If the name is given in a 700-711 field in a form essentially the same as it appears on the piece, it need not be given anywhere else in the record, UNLESS a note is needed to clear up any ambiguities/confusion regarding the relationship of the name to the resource (that might affect identification of the resource).

We believe that the need for a statement of responsibility is often iffy but is important whenever it aids users with the identification of a serial. On the other hand, the uniform title also speaks to the need for unique identification.

I think it should be somewhere in the record, though I wouldn't have a problem with it being in a note rather than the title and statement of responsibility area. I think that, aside from the \$a,n,p, too much changeable information in the title and statement of responsibility area can be confusing to receivers wondering whether the piece in hand matches the record. Question need to transcribe statement of responsibility in 245. Often it is duplicated in its entirety by 260 subfield b. When it is not, prefer to use cataloger judgement about whether to transcribe in a note or omit.

When available, I think it provides useful descriptive access, especially if the "as is" form differs from the authoritative form (and hasn't been cross referenced). A user doing a key word search on the "as is" form will be able to pull up the record. I prefer to keep the present practice of "discretion" as to when to give a SOR or not.

Currently the statement of responsibility is entered in the following fields:

110  
245 / \$c  
550  
710

In certain instances, a body that is cited in the 245 \$c is also entered in 260 \$b

Some possible reasons for retaining transcribed statements of responsibility might be:

- Identification: If the transcribed form of the name is very different from the authorized form (e.g., for an English-language edition of an Arabic newsletter), then the 245 \$c or

- 550 may assist in identification of the serial
- Identification as serial changes over time: Catalogers receive discontinuous issues for maintenance. That happens because (a) check-in units route issues when significant change is perceived; or (b) the library receives only occasional issues. Especially in the latter case, the date ranges in a 550 field may be helpful in identifying whether your issues of a serial could be added to an existing record (or whether you need a new record). If date ranges could be added to the 710 field, then the 550 field might not be needed for this purpose.

Retain -especially for print. The reasoning is: when later issues have a different issuing body, it helps to know the earlier one for purposes of identification.

## **2. What redundancies could we eliminate from the catalog record?**

Any 580 note that can be sufficiently handled by generating a note from the 76X-78X field.  
Lang (FF), 041, 546 – can most records stand with only one or at the outside two of these? Three fields seem to be overkill.

Freq (FF), 310, 321 – are both FF Freq and 310 needed? Records can only include up to three 321s, so the 321s only provide a partial picture in some cases.

FF Dates, 260 |c, 362

Are all 2XX fields necessary? We believe 240 is essential but wonder how often 210s are used (we are aware that MedLine uses 210s); 222 is often redundant. Has there been any progress with harmonization in regard to qualifiers?

037 field is often quickly dated – it's not redundant, but how valuable is it?

Are all elements of 300 necessary?

538 mode of access note and 007 |b

One that comes to mind is the 310, since that's coded in the fixed field. But I feel like the 310/321 fields, though maybe not very helpful to a user, are helpful to staff who do holdings for serials.

Dislike having to record frequency in 310 when it merely repeats info represented by FF Freq. 310 should only be used if FF alone cannot adequately reflect true frequency.

Citing the same corporate body twice: in the 260 and again as a 550.

Adding a 730 when the same title is already accessed in a 772.

Rather than one-size-fits all, could these question be considered in terms of categories of publications? One possible way to separate types of records might be:

- Commercially-published European-language serials with ISSN: This would cover most Elsevier, Blackwell, Sage, Springer, and Wiley publications.
- Other European-language serials: Includes many society publications, government documents, and smaller presses unfamiliar with ISSN
- Serials in non-European languages: Often, these are uniquely represented in a single collection. Both library staff & users need all the help they can get to identify these & to relate them to other publications.

Also, could these questions be considered w/r/t the level of data—whether the data is suitable for a bib record, a holdings record, or an acquisitions purchase order?

Category 1:

Assumptions:

- (a) The publishers are operating under a profit motive. Part of that motive should be dedicated to retaining library customers.

- (b) The publishers are aware of ONIX, SFX, etc.

#### Cataloging simplification

- (a) Publishers should be responsible for supplying OCLC with, and maintaining, accurate data on: title, publisher, numbering (and reconciling numbering both online & print)  
 (b) Catalogers should be responsible for classification & subject analysis

Specific fields: For category 1 publications, much of the data currently entered/maintained in a bib record is available elsewhere. For identification and navigation (=relating) of BIB RECORDS, the following BIB data fields should be considered:

Field/subfield	Comment
LDR	All
FF	008/35-37 Lang 008/06 DtSt 008/07-10 Dates1 008/11-14 Dates2 008/15-17 Ctry 008/34 Entry convention
010	LCCN: Identifier
020	ISBN: for earliest issue cataloged
022	ISSN: Identifier: authenticated against ISSN Portal
012	For CONSER distribution control
015, 016	National Bibliography Number
019	OCLC control number
025, 027, 029, 030, 032, 035, 036	Any other ID numbers
040	Cataloging Source
050/060/086/090/096, etc.	Classification numbers
?130	Uniform title?
245	Title (\$a, \$n, \$p, \$h): NO SUBTITLES or statements of responsibility
246	Alternate titles, including subtitles if desired for keyword access
260	\$3 dates \$b Publisher.
310	Only if needed to distinguish 2 publications (e.g., monthly/quarterly statistics report)
362	First issue in hand (1 <sup>st</sup> Indicator = 0): Following current standard First issue not in hand (1 <sup>st</sup> indicator = 1): Should include beginning date of publication, if known, plus DBO.
525	To Consider: Do these need to be on a separate record for ONIX-pushed maintenance?
555	To Consider: Do these need to be on a separate record for ONIX for ONIX-pushed maintenance?
580	For complex relationships
6XX	Subjects
710, 711	These headings should include subfield showing date-range of application, if known
730, 740	
77X, 78X	
810, 830	Series. This field should be expanded to include subfield for numeric/date range (for series that only appear on some issues) Also should be able to include \$x ISSN in 810, 830
936	Parallel language record #

Comment on Category 1 publications:

--These are not publications of personal authorship.

--Place of publication is increasingly difficult with both online & multinational category 1 publishers. Do we care whether an Elsevier publication comes out of Amsterdam or Orlando or San Diego?

--Frequency: These are often whimsical. More appropriate for 8X3/8X3 (e.g., 853/863) than for bib record



Category 2: Other European-language serials: Includes many society publications, government documents, and smaller presses unfamiliar with ISSN.

Assumptions:

- (a) These publishers are less likely to participate in standards-creation, so less likely to understand the need for consistent representation of title, etc.
- (b) The publications issued by these publishers are more likely to require hand-crafted records.
- (c) These publications are NOT usually uniquely held by one library, but are held by under 10 libraries

Category 3: Serials in non-European languages: Often, these are uniquely represented in a single collection. Both library staff & users need all the help they can get to identify these & to relate them to other publications

Assumptions

- (a) The publishers of these serials are not participating in standards-creation, nor are they necessarily following a Western tradition of publishing.
- (b) Issues of these publications are usually uniquely held by one institution or another. E.g., LC may have issue for 1997; UCLA, issue for 2000

Specific fields: The following fields should be considered as needed for BIB data

Field/subfield	Comment
LDR	All
FF	008/35-37 Lang 008/06 DtSt 008/07-10 Dates1 008/11-14 Dates2 008/15-17 Ctry 008/34 Entry convention
010	LCCN: Identifier
<b>020</b>	ISBN: for earliest issue cataloged
022	ISSN: Identifier [may or may not be authenticated. Need to distinguish—could one use an indicator code?]
012	For CONSER distribution control
015, 016	National Bibliography Number
019	OCLC control number
025, 027, 029, 030, 032, 035, 036	Any other ID numbers
040	Cataloging Source
050/060/086/090/096, etc.	Classification numbers
100 or 110 or  ?130 240?	110: Would it be simpler in certain specific cases (annual reports) to re-consider the option of a formulaic entry for situations where the focus of the serial is the corporate body rather than the title?
245	Title (\$a, \$n, \$p \$h \$b \$c)
246	Alternate titles, <b>including subtitles if desired</b> for keyword access
<b>260</b>	\$3 dates \$a Place ( <b>for paper serials &amp; microform reproductions</b> ) : \$b Publisher. \$3 dates \$b Publisher. ( <b>for all other formats</b> ) \$a Place : \$b Publisher, \$c date. [for reprint serials]
310	For paper serials & microform reproductions: Often, one library gets monthly, another gets quarterly report; no easy way to identify that two different publications are involved unless frequency is given from the beginning For other serials: optional

<b>362</b>	First issue in hand (1 <sup>st</sup> Indicator =0): Following current standard First issue not in hand (1 <sup>st</sup> indicator = 1): Should include beginning date of publication, if known, plus DBO.
500	LIC: This is useful for little-owned serials
<b>515</b> [limited]	For: (1) Items issued in multiple parts; (2) known suspensions
525	
530	
546	
550	
555	
580	For complex relationships
6XX	Subjects
710, 711	These headings should include subfield showing date-range of application, if known
730, 740	
77X, 78X	
810, 830	Series. This field should be expanded to include subfield for numeric/date range (for series that only appear on some issues). Also should be able to include \$x ISSN in 810, 830
856	[often freely-available]
88X fields	Vernacular fields
936	Parallel language record # "DO NOT CONFUSE WITH" note

Additional comments:

Certain categories of serials may always require special attention, e.g.:

- Analyzed serials & monographic series
- Reprints of serials

Most felt that redundancy is not bad per se. However, all of the catalogers hated the coding for 007 (formatting characteristics for microforms, and computer files). Similarly, the 006 came in second as the most hated MARC field.

041 and 546

043 and 6XX

310 and field frequency code

530 and 776

580 and 7XX links, potential changes to indicator values needed?

530 "Also issued online" vs presence of 856 (with appropriate indicator value)

Examine use of fixed field coding "periodical" vs subfield v –periodicals

Eliminate added entries when covered by linking fields

### **3. Are there any punctuation and spacing rules that seem unnecessary?**

Terminal punctuation in almost every field, besides what is part of what's being transcribed (like a question mark, or a period that is part of an abbreviation), is unnecessary. But it should probably be retained in 5XX

Notes that are formulated as complete normal English sentences. A single space is sufficient in every place where we have traditionally used two or more spaces.

We suggest that card-centric punctuation be reconsidered and that punctuation be consistent – use periods or don't use periods at the end of fields (we prefer skipping them). We believe that some ISBD punctuation is practical, for example \_:\_ makes a 130 more eye-readable (New York, N.Y. : Online). However we also wonder whether this kind of spacing could be handled by ILS vendors and other online systems rather than being input by catalogers, although that may well be very wishful thinking.

Not sure what you mean here. ISBD? I feel the standard is important and don't see how different punctuation/spacing would improve a record. In fact I think altering it may not be a good idea. Even angle vs. square brackets-it takes some time to learn the difference but once you do the meaning is important. Though we recently had a question from a public services librarian about ISBD punctuation-- why we put a space colon space before the 245 \$b, because when users download the record into Endnote citation software, the space remains in their citation.

Consistent punctuation provides a stable superstructure for the record. The less you notice it, the better. I'm comfortable with the status quo. Although -- I wouldn't mind a consistent "end of field" mark: either always end a line with a period (unless another point of punctuation is used) or never -- our own Ill opac removes all ending period punctuation. Ending punctuation is a card convention not necessarily useful -- unless a card display is desired.

Rule	Comment
RI 1.0C	<p>Period:</p> <p>This RI was good in the sense that it put us all out of our misery, or at least those who agonized about fields ending in periods. But now that it's all down on paper, could some go through &amp; simplify. E.g.:</p> <p>Note fields ending in period v. fields not ending in period: For computer-based catalogs, this is not significant. What if catalogers dropped the final period for all fields?</p>

Simplify area 1 to title proper + GMD(?) (negative consequences for authority work?)

Eliminate the distinction between main and added entries

Eliminate, reduce or clarify (e.g., state universities) fixed field coding for gov docs

Clarify or provide simplified guidance on title change rules

Simplify or provide simplified guidance on rules for corporate bodies with subordination (government vs. non-government differences, etc.)

Simplify punctuation and spacing

Eliminate the distinction between formatted and unformatted 362?

Separate useful public and non-public (cataloger, acquisitions) information

Eliminate entry under uniform title for translations and language editions

Move non-Roman access points from bibliographic records to authority records

Do we need to give subscription information?

Determine what should be in the bibliographic record vs what should be elsewhere, e.g., acquisitions records, authority records, ERMS, etc.

Eliminate fields where information quickly becomes obsolete, e.g., detailed system requirements for CD-ROMs, 856 URLs (?)

Consider information in terms of first-time provision vs. ongoing maintenance. Who maintains? What fields should be maintained?

Explore efficiencies after OCLC implements MARC holdings format, i.e., can some information be removed from bib records, e.g., pattern information?

Eliminate "mode of access: World Wide Web"

Make it simple, and end each MARC variant field with a period.

**4. Are uniform titles really helpful? Do differentiating and/or collocating uniform titles really serve a valuable purpose for the user? What changes to the rules/LCRIs would you suggest?**

This is a huge area to look into, and does not affect Access Level records alone. Access Level records must fit properly into catalogs that contain other levels of records, so all of the same rules regarding uniform titles should apply equally to all records. I can possibly see an argument for only creating uniform titles when secondary access is needed somewhere for the resource, but I fear that such a provision would end up probably requiring more research in each instance than just following current standards...

We believe uniform titles are necessary. However, place and publisher can be either helpful or entirely meaningless to users – corporate name might be more consistent and valid when available, and of course a change in corporate body name will force a new record. How uniform titles are constructed needs to be reconsidered.

Oh, this question makes me nervous. I find uniform titles useful and good (though it seems that serials catalogers got along fine without them pre-AACR2). Collocating may have value to a user—especially in the case of having the print and online show up one right under the other in a title list. Differentiation may be of value to a user, if the qualifier is meaningful. I prefer corporate body as a qualifier when possible and appropriate, realizing that, though this may be more useful to users, it undoubtedly creates more work for catalogers. I don't have any suggestions for changes in the rules/RIs. I feel that RI 25.5b allows for enough judgment in choice of qualifier.

Good question. Adding arbitrary artificial additions to an existing title may help us and other librarians in their various functions (serials, acquisitions, check-in, etc.), but I am not sure how much it really helps the user in matching the title in the catalog with the work they are looking for. But finding a solution? User studies (and I am sure there are many) might help in determining how people actually find things which might lead to more constructive rules. In my own case, whenever I search a generic title in OCLC, like "annual report" or "Post", I first perform a "scan title" and see what uniform titles show up in the list. Then I'll perform the search again as a key word, usually title and place of publication, publisher, or known issuing body to pull up any non-AACR2 style records. It works for me pretty well. The problem with narrowing by place of publication is the possibility that the form appearing in the 260 may not be the form I am familiar with: Say, Munchen, as opposed to Munich. The Uniform title's frequent use of standard place names is a help in this regard. But then again, wouldn't a German speaking user searching a German title know to limit by "Munchen" rather than "Munich"? Searches can be limited more precisely and cheaply than they could in the "card" and "dumb terminal" days -- so Maybe uniform titles aren't necessary anymore?

Abandon uniform titles for translations and simultaneous language editions. The linking fields adequately connect the records (and in fact the links themselves are much more easily comprehensible to users if they have only title proper rather than uniform title). Not to mention the great frustration of having to create a successive record for a language ed. that has not changed



title simply because the "primary language" ed. did so!

From past experience, the uniform title seems to be used for

- Identifying the correct record in a utility (OCLC) during cataloging
- Identifying the correct record in a local catalog during checkin
- Distinguishing in the title browse index in a local catalog for reference queries
- Merging records from various sources into a union catalog (e.g., Melvyl)

Suggested change#1: Stop publishing serials with the same titles. If commercial publishers could only copyright content for unique titles, then a large segment of the problem would disappear.

Suggested change#2: In case of conflict, only create a uniform title in limited instances, e.g.: (1) if serial lacks authenticated ISSN; or (2) if the serial has a generic title; or (3) the serial/series is analyzed. The title plus ISSN will create a unique link.

It was felt by all catalogers, that the uniform title for translation needed to be done away with (example: Russian title followed by subfield leng)

## **5. How can we simplify/streamline numbering and dates in the 260 and 362 fields?**

In the 362, enter the number/date as found most prominently on the piece.

We have nothing revolutionary to suggest other than wondering whether the 260 date is necessary given the FF dates. Transcribing what is on the piece being described seems eminently reasonable. The 362 serves a different purpose than the 260 |c and FF dates.

This is an aside, but the 362 does not display in our OPAC brief display. Reference felt that people were confused by it-that they thought that's what UGA holds (nevermind the holdings information right there below the brief display).

This is perhaps one confusing aspect when learning to catalog serials: 362 1 vs. 362 0, when and when not to add a date in the 260 \$c and when, even if you have the first and last issue, do you bracket that date, etc. But we feel that really once you learn this it becomes second nature.

I like the current practice: publication dates can differ from issuing dates, so I would prefer to keep these separate. I also prefer the current form of the 362: I think that the more our description matches what is on the piece, the better. At least until photographic representations of the first and latest issue become the norm.

"Simplification" is a tricky concept. Could simplify by only using the 362 field and never using the 260 \$c. This might result in confusion for those cases where the actual date of publication is important (e.g., reprints). Also might create problems when multiple 260 field is implemented. But it would simplify the record in terms of reducing the number of data elements.

Instead of keying numbers the way they appears on the material, it would help, if we all used one standard (whatever that standard is).

## **6. Are there any types of notes that just aren't all that helpful?**

538 notes for remote electronic resources that have 856 field.

Are 5XX justifying notes for 700s and 710s absolutely necessary?

530 can be readily handled into 775 |i

We are wondering about the 538 Mode of Access note for electronic serials. Perhaps it could become more like the systems requirement note in that we would use it only if the mode of access were ever anything other than World Wide Web.

I could happily do without the "source of title" note, or at least limit the circumstances in which it is

needed. How about: abolish "title from cover" and even "title from caption" and add "title from serial title page." The last is far rarer and more noteworthy than the first two. I would prefer simple frequency notes that allowed for frequencies intended to be regular but which are often erratic without being completely irregular. "Monthly (irregular)" may not be a pleasant sight for the check-in staff, but I still think it is a short and sweet way of stating: this publication was intended to be monthly, but due to a number of reasons such as lack of funds, limited staff, or turbulent political situations, it just wasn't possible to consistently bring it out 12 issues a year. I have also run across more than a few periodicals in which "310 Frequency varies" would have been quite appropriate.

515 (Numbering peculiarity note) Eliminate this note for e-resources, and if possible even for print materials. It is not all that useful in a long running serial.

**7. Are there ways to simplify the decision-making for establishing corporate names, e.g. could anything be done to simplify the non-government vs. government headings, subordinate headings, etc., that would help the user?**

How about setting rules for all governments and corporate bodies to follow, and if they don't follow them we just refuse to catalog their publications? ;)

Good question. We gave a copy of this survey to Mary Beth Betzhold, the University at Buffalo's NACO coordinator, and believe that she will respond separately to this question and perhaps to others as well, since she has a background in serials cataloging.

I can't think of any ways to do this, but in my experience a simplification of this process would really cut down on the time it takes to catalog a record. I spend a large amount of time agonizing over 24.13 and 24.18 and related rules.

Not sure of the solution, but I have certainly run across the extremes of this problem (alert -- going off on a slight tangent -- alert): Latin American government agencies that make subtle and not so subtle changes of name:

Argentina Ministerio De Hacienda De La Nacion  
Argentina Secretaria De Estado De Hacienda

Or

Costa Rica Ministerio De Relaciones Exteriores  
Costa Rica Ministerio De Relaciones Exteriores E Instruccion Publica  
Costa Rica Ministerio De Relaciones Exteriores Justicia Gracia Culto Y Beneficencia  
Costa Rica. Secretaría de Hacienda, Relaciones Exteriores, Culto é Instrucción Pública  
Costa Rica Secretaria De Relaciones Exteriores  
Costa Rica Secretaria De Relaciones Exteriores Gracia Justicia Y Culto  
Costa Rica Secretaria De Relaciones Exteriores Justicia Y Gracia Culto Y Benefencia  
Etc.

Finding an annual report put out by one of these ever changing ministries can be a searching nightmare if they are cataloged CONSER style with NACO authority work -- I know. I've done the cataloging. After years of doing so, I began to value the LC approach of using minimal NUC records (with barebones 110's for the ministries) as their cataloging copy. I eventually did the same, embellishing their single records in our opac with multiple 246's for the numerous title changes and adding 710's for the corporate body changes. It wasn't a perfect solution, but I think the result was a little more user friendly than the multiple successive records. Whenever I search the CONSER style records of one ministry's annual report, I need to use creative key word searches to collocate them.

Establishing corporate names IS a problem, largely due to the complexity of establishing headings for subordinate bodies. Some thoughts:

- (1) Are there instances where we are establishing subordinate headings when the main heading would be more useful for retrieval? E.g.: departments that just have to do with preparation of the publication, e.g., Printing Office, Statistics Unit
- (2) Could we have one set of rules for subordination, rather than 24.13 & 24.18?

Government bodies could be one category, entered under the name of the jurisdiction. NGO's could another category, entered independently if the name uniquely identifies a subordinate body.

Conferences could be another category, requiring a task group & many years of therapy to understand.

(4) Direct or indirect (24.14, 24.19): This is another source of grief for the cataloger.

Harder to solve, since its application simplifies record creation & record maintenance

**8. Are all of the linking entries really necessary? What form should they take to help the user? Should we suggest new indicator values for some linking entries (merged with to form; formed by the union of) to eliminate the need for the 580 field?**

As catalogs and standards evolve, linking entries seem to be getting more important; I wouldn't advise getting rid of any. It would be nice to try something with the "merged with ... to form ..." situation, but I wonder about the ability of systems to properly implement something new here (when we sometimes can't get them to properly implement what's already been around for ages...)

"Formed by the union of ..." shouldn't need any new indicator values; it just needs further development at the ILS end to use the indicator value already defined.

We believe that 780-785 linking fields are necessary so long as successive entry cataloging is the standard. However, if the 780 and 785 are properly set up we do not think that most 580s are necessary unless the user has to use a poorly constructed online catalog. We believe that the 776 is useful. Other 7XXs are not used all that much but can be illuminating when they are used. We feel they are. Especially when in an opac they are hotlinked and a click can take a user to the related record.

Might be a good idea to suggest new indicator values for some linking entries, though I'm not sure the need for the 580 can ever be totally eliminated. There will be cases when, even with new indicator values, the linking fields alone won't be enough to explain the situation. Also we need the 580 when mentioning another title for which there is no record in the database.

I'm ever more sympathetic to a latest or earliest entry approach. The fewer links, the better. And, although this is a technology and not a rules issue: in online catalogs, links should be hyperlinked, preferably by lccn or oclc number. I would agree to new indicator values to get rid of the redundant 580 note.

For Category 2 & 3 publications: Linking entries have often been a life-saver for staff trying to identify related titles.

Agree that relationships do need to be rethought in light of FRBR. Whether new indicator values should be developed or whether a relator subfield (e.g., \$2) could be used needs more discussion.

The use of the 580 field for merged-with-to-form is a separate issue. The decision to retain 580 in these cases was based on limitations of displays for LC's Voyager catalog. Is display for LC still a concern?

My catalogers felt that the 787 field could be eliminated in records cataloged based on the "floor concept"; similarly the 776 Language edition

**9. What other ideas do you have to simplify catalog while improving usability of the records?**

Eliminate one or more (or sometimes even all) subfields of 300, unless (a) the resource is complete and the number of units is helpful, or (b) the SMD is necessary for access/identification,

or (c) the noting of details is really important and not obvious from anything else in the record.

We have mixed feelings about latest entry, but hope that the concept will be seriously considered. We believe that latest entry records make more sense to the average user than successive entry records do – wasn't the successive entry concept implemented in order to save time in a [now dated] card catalog environment? However, if a library doesn't have an entire run of a title – but receives a single volume or two that falls in the middle of a run – creating an accurate latest entry record would be extremely challenging and time consuming. Also, if successive entry were abandoned, what would happen to the tens of thousands (or more!) records that adhere to that concept?

In cataloging electronic serials, we can spend a lot of time searching for place of publication information. We wonder how important 260 \$a is in a serial record. Is it really necessary?

(I'm just going to shoot for the moon here) For an online catalog environment: include scan of the cover or other chief source of information for the first and latest issue.

One greatest deterrents to partnering with publishers for creating/maintaining metadata for category 1 serials may be the complexity of AACR2 21.2 + 21.3B1. Could the idea of major/minor change be re-cast in terms of general principles so non-catalogers would have an easier time predicting when a new record is needed? At what point would it make more sense to think in terms of an XML-based CONSER record that has all the data elements needed & that can cluster the data elements more meaningfully; and that (for now) is mapped to a traditional MARC record?

My catalogers suggested that for intangible e-resources, we use the smd in the 300 subfield a.

#### **Other Comments**

Luiz Mendes & I were discussing the idea of moving the CONSER database to XML structure (with mappings to MARC). Luiz contributed the idea (and I agreed) that if we were really able to re-do the record structure outside of MARC, then we would like to see all relational fields (including series, which is just a specific type of part/whole) represented by one tag with qualifiers to show the relationship. These single XML fields could map to multiple MARC fields in conformance w/AACR2 (e.g., 21.28 for supplements).

Simplify rules for form of LCCNs of various styles and at various places in records so that it is always recorded in same form (use or omission of hyphen, supplying or not of leading zeroes in place of hyphen, use or omission of leading spaces) Rules for subfield w of links are particularly difficult, given the odd spacing requirements depending on prefix.

Choose one spelling for disc or disk and use it consistently. The distinction is meaningless to most people.

Define one set of criteria for describing a serial as a periodical--as it now stands, the standards for FF SrTp are different than those for the subject subdivision, which means neither is consistently applied.

Choose one abbreviation for "volume" irrespective of its position in the record.

If ISBD prescribed punctuation is still considered to be necessary, work with OCLC to have it become system-supplied, using the subfield coding to determine its placement.

User most wants to know: what is the title, who is responsible for it, what's it about?

Principle: elements should be present in the access-level record to satisfy the needs of the resource and the needs of the user

Encourage bibliographic access by preservation reformatting institution

### **Practices and Procedures specific to LC that could be simplified**

- 1) Mono to serial recataloging
- 2) Consider whether some titles are better cataloged as monographs, e.g., conference proceedings, catalogs, festivals, exhibitions
- 3) ***Simplify and reduce documentation (affects CONSER also)***

### **Working Group “Parking Lot” Issues Not Fully Documented Above**

**Definition of “Periodicals”:** Align the definition of the fixed field value for “Periodicals” with the subject subdivision. Either revise SH 19.27 to limit the use of \$v Periodicals to journals/magazines with individual articles (“true” periodicals), or redefine the fixed field. It is difficult to train catalogers when one term can have different definitions in the catalog record.

**Redundancies in Catalog Records:** Explore better use of machine-readable data in OPACs (e.g., fixed field information, 041 language codes) so that it can be converted to eye-readable information in the public catalog record. Align definitions and uses of coded data vs. data in note fields so as to allow the former to replace the latter whenever possible.

**Capitalization, Abbreviations and Punctuation:** Explore a simplification of cataloging rules to allow for transcription of data as it appears, particularly in designation statements. Also, systems should be designed to supply as much punctuation as possible. Simplify the coding of MARC records so that every field either ends in a mark of punctuation or it doesn’t.

**Data Appropriate to the Bibliographic Record:** We need further analysis of what kinds of data is best stored in records such as holdings, authority, and check-in records. Such data could be retrieved and displayed in an OPAC to help give a complete picture of a serial title, but would allow for further simplification of the bibliographic record itself.